THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, APRIL, 1911

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Oregon, South Dakota, California, Maryland, and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

State Organizations Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

MASSACHUSETTS

Thirty-nine Branch Committees; 15,317 members in 299 cities, towns, and villages.*

MISS MARY S. AMES, President.

MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,
MISS AGNES IRWIN,
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,
Vice-Presidents.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer, Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y. Room 615 Kensington Building, Boston.

* *Net present membership of women over 21 years of age: eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations and removals from the state*

NEW YORK

MRS. ARTHUR M. DODGE, President.
MRS. FRITZ ACHELIS, First Vice-President.
MRS. FRANCIS S. BANGS, Treasurer.
MRS. GEORGE PHILLIPS, Secretary.

MRS. ELIHU ROOT,
MRS. RICHARD WATSON GILDER,
MRS. FRANCIS M. SCOTT,
Honorary Vice-Presidents.

MRS. WILLIAM A. PUTNAM,
MRS. ROBERT McVICKAR,
MRS. GEORGE DOUGLAS MILLER,
MRS. WILLIAM P. NORTHRUP,
Vice-Presidents.

Chairmen of Auxiliaries

MRS. WINSLOW CRANNELL, Albany.
MRS. WILLIAM A. PUTNAM, Brooklyn.
MRS. WILLIAM P. NORTHRUP, Buffalo.
MRS. ROBERT McVICKAR, Mt. Vernon.
MRS. HENRY F. BURTON, Rochester.
MRS. J. K. PAIGE, Schenectady,
MRS. JOHN W. GILLETTE, Hudson.

LLINOIS

MRS. CAROLINE F. CORBIN, President.
MRS. S. M. NICKERSON,
MRS. R. J. OGLESBY,
MRS. J. M. WALKER,
Vice-Presidents.
MRS. T. B. BLACKSTONE,
MRS. GEO. W. KRETZINGER, Rec. Sec'y.
MISS J. C. FAIRFIELD, Treasurer and Distributor of Literature, 1523 Dearborn Avenue, Chicago.

OREGON

MRS. FRANCIS J. BAILEY, President. Alexandra Court, Portland.
MISS FAILING,
MRS. R. W. WILBUR,
Vice-Presidents.
MRS. WALLACE McCAMANT, Treasurer.
MISS ELEANOR E. GILE, Secretary.

Executive Committee

MRS. HENRY W. CORBETT,
MRS. HELEN LADD CORBETT,
MRS. J. B. MONTGOMERY,
MRS. A. E. ROCKEY,
MRS. C. H. LEWIS,
MRS. ELIZABETH HAMILTON,
MRS. DAVID LORING,
MRS. HERBERT HOLMAN,

PENNSYLVANIA

MRS. J. GARDNER CASSATT, President.

MRS. GEORGE F. BAER,
MRS. W. W. BIRDSALL,
MISS SOPHY D. IRWIN,
MISS MARY NEWHALL,
MRS. WILLIAM L. McLEAN,
MRS. JOHN THOMPSON SPENCER,
Vice-Presidents.

MISS ELISE WILLING BALCH, Treasurer.
MRS. CHARLES BINGHAM PENROSE, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. BRINTON COXE, Cor. Sec'y.

Executive Committee

MRS. ARTHUR BIDDLE,
MRS. HORACE BROCK,
MRS. EDWARD BROWNING,
MRS. SAMUEL GRANT DIEHL,
MRS. JOSEPH J. DIMOND,
MRS. JOSEPH M. FOX,
MRS. HORACE BINNEY HARE,
MRS. FRANK T. GRISWOLD,
MISS JULIA M. KEIM,
MRS. JAMES LARGE,
MRS. JOHN MARKOE,
MRS. FRANK SAMUEL,
MRS. JAMES FRANCIS SULLIVAN,
MRS. RODMAN WISTER,
MRS. CHARLES WHEELER.

MARYLAND

MRS. ROBERT GARRETT, President.
MRS. FRANCIS T. REDWOOD, First Vice-President.
MRS. P. THOMPSON COYLE, Second Vice-President.
MRS. ARTHUR KINSOLVING, Third Vice-President.
MRS. HOBART DUVALL, Fourth Vice-President.
MISS CATHERINE MOONE SELFE, Rec. Sec'y.
MISS CAROLINE LATIMER, Cor. Sec'y and Treasurer. 823 Hamilton Terrace, Baltimore.
MISS AMELIE FOWLER,
MRS. T. HARRISON GARRETT,
MISS ELLA HOLT,
MRS. CAMPBELL MORTIMER,
MRS. WALDO NEWCOMER,
MRS. D'ARCY PAUL,
MRS. ALEXANDER PRESTON,
MRS. GOODEY ROSENFELD,
MRS. JOSEPH H. RIEMAN,
MRS. DOUGLAS THOMAS,
Honorary Vice-Presidents.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

MRS. GEORGE A. CASWELL, President.
MRS. HENRY T. LEE, First Vice-President.
MRS. MARSHALL WOTKYNS, Second Vice-President.
MRS. JONATHAN R. SCOTT, Treasurer.
MRS. GEORGE L. FISCHER, Secretary.
MRS. A. G. L. TREW,
MRS. JOSEPH MESMER,
MRS. CAMERON E. THOM,
MRS. WALTER HUGHES,
MRS. J. B. LIPPINCOTT,
MRS. JOSEPHINE BUTLER,
MISS ANNA MAICHEL,
MRS. M. J. CONNELL,
MRS. SPENCER H. SMITH,
Vice-Presidents.

RHODE ISLAND

MRS. ROLAND G. HAZARD, President.
MISS LOUISE C. HOPPIN,
MRS. HOWARD O. STURGIS,
MRS. S. O. METCALF,
Vice-Presidents.
MRS. ALBERT G. HARKNESS, Secretary and Treasurer.

Standing Committee

MRS. ELISHA HOWARD,
MRS. FREDERICK C. HOPPIN,
MISS TAFT,
MRS. ROBERT I. GAMMELL,
MRS. WILLIAM GAMMELL,
MRS. G. ALDER BLUMER.

IOWA COMMITTEE

MRS. SIMON CASADY,
MRS. MARTIN FLYNN,
MRS. JOHN H. MERRILL,
MISS SARAH NOLLEN,
MRS. FRANK D. JACKSON,
MRS. H. C. ALVERSON,
MISS KATHERINE G. WILLIS.

MAINE COMMITTEE

MRS. SIDNEY W. THAXTER, Secretary, Portland.
MRS. CHARLES S. OGDEN, Portland.
MRS. JAMES P. BAXTER, Portland.
MRS. CLARENCE H. CORNING, Portland.
MRS. F. A. QUINBY, Portland.
MISS LOUISA SPRING, Portland.
MISS CATHERINE P. TALBOT, Portland.
MISS HANNAH L. TALBOT, Portland.
MISS MARY KING LONGFELLOW, Portland.
MISS ELINOR S. MOODY, Portland.
MISS MARION RICHMOND WEEKS, Portland.
MRS. JOHN F. THOMPSON, Portland.
MRS. JOHN M. GLIDDEN, Newcastle.
MRS. P. M. BLAKE, Bangor.
MRS. F. C. ROBINSON, Brunswick.

MASSACHUSETTS SUFFRAGISTS AGAIN DEFEATED

There was a large attendance at the hearing at the State House, on the evening of February 23, on petitions asking for an amendment to the Constitution striking the word "male" from the qualifications of voters. The hearing on behalf of the suffragists was conducted by Mr. John Weaver Sherman, representing the American Federation of Labor, assisted by Mrs. Theresa A. Crowley. Charles R. Saunders, Esq., of Boston, counsel for the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, conducted the case for the remonstrants. Mrs. J. B. Millet of Boston, in behalf of the Association, read a

Remonstrance Against the Petitions

The statement declared that the more than [illegible],000 women of voting

age, tax-paying women, wage-earners and others, enrolled in the Association, residing in 305 different cities, towns and villages in Massachusetts, protested against woman suffrage because they believed that it would be injurious both to women themselves and to the State. They asked the members of the committee to consult the women in their own homes and neighborhoods, if they doubted whether the majority of women were opposed to woman suffrage.

Professor William T. Sedgwick

of the Institute of Technology, spoke in behalf of the remonstrants as follows:

I am a remonstrant because I do not believe that woman suffrage would be for the best interests either of the State or of woman. Of the State, because nowadays nobody can do all things and everybody must therefore let other people do some things. This arrangement we call the division of duties, or of labor, and since it permits specialization, and keeps us from being merely jacks-of-all-trades and masters of none, it is rightly regarded as the very basis of civilized and highly organized society. Now men are different from women, and do some things better than women do and some worse, and it is clearly best for the State to have men do those things they can do best, and women those they can do best. On the whole, experience has shown that men are best fitted for the work of politicians, sailors, soldiers, miners, policemen, lumbermen, farmers, and other largely outdoor pursuits, while women are better fitted for less exposed, quieter, lighter and more in-door labors. Again, I do not believe that woman suffrage would be for the best interests of woman herself, for many reasons, — one of which is that the physical strain of modern life upon women is already so severe as to have caused grave and anxious comment upon the subject by physicians (including women physicians), and politics means a kind of warfare or battle full of excitement and physical strain.

Mrs. A. J. George of Brookline

spoke in substance as follows:

You have heard much tonight concerning the wage-earning woman. Her difficulties are many and grievous, but they are industrial and economic rather than political. According to the census of 1910 there are five million women in industry in the United States, but of this number about one-third are under 21 years of age and one-half are under 25 years of age. The short duration of woman's industrial life and her consequent lack of skill and her failure to organize have much to do with the low wage scale of women. Is it reasonable to assume that if all women voted the interests of the working woman would be better safe-guarded than they are now by the electorate of men, since only one woman in six over 21 years of age is a wage-earner? Could the one woman convince the other five to vote for *her* interests?

When we speak of the woman in industry we think of the overworked and often underpaid girls of the mills and factories, but as a matter of fact there are about 62 per cent more women engaged in domestic and personal service in this country, than in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits. We have heard a plea for higher wages for the women school teachers, and the enfranchisement of all women has been urged as a means to that end; as a matter of census reports we find that there are more laundresses than there are teachers, and almost twice as many agricultural laborers among women as there are laundresses. Would all women voting vote for the interests of the school teacher; even supposing that wages can be regulated by legislation, not by the law of supply and demand, as is the true case?

Unless the suffrage is to help the condition of all women and all men, and so benefit the State, it is inexpedient that so much time and energy and money should be expended without a compensating gain.

Charles R. Saunders, Esq.,

of Boston, said in part:

The 15,000 Massachusetts women organized in opposition to this proposed amendment have no desire to check the aspirations of their sisters on the other side. In any field of private endeavor they wish them every success. If, unfortunately, failure happens there, as sometimes it must, it is the individual's own loss.

But when the women on the other side undertake to assume political duties, with which the environment of their lives gives them little opportunity for familiarity, and failure comes, it is a very different matter. It would be a failure that would vitally involve us all. It would be a blow that would weaken the principle of popular government itself.

Nor do the women whom I represent desire to shirk any of their duties. They are busy each day with the cares of their households and with work in educational, charitable and philanthropic fields. No one proposes to relieve them of any of these necessary duties. No man could perform them half as well.

Conscious of their superiority to men in these fields of labor, they think it strange if there is not some field in which men can do better work than women. They believe that field is politics. They have no desire to participate in primaries or attend ward rallies, or to endure any all-night, 28 hour filibustering session of Congress, or be dragged from their beds at six o'clock Sunday morning by a Sergeant-at-Arms to make a quorum.

The remonstrants dislike to come here. They begrudge the time from their proper duties. But they feel it is necessary to appear in order that the attitude of the sex may not be misrepresented by a small, but vociferous, minority — a minority which in a moment of ecstasy Miss Pankhurst at Ford Hall declared was striving for it knew not what.

Adverse Report

The Committee on Constitutional Amendments reported "leave to withdraw" March 21, 8 to 3. Last year, the vote was 7 to 4.

Defeated in the House

April 4, a motion to substitute the amendment for the report was defeated in the House by a vote of 69 yeas to 161 nays. There were no pairs. In 1910, the vote, counting pairs, was 54 yeas to 155 nays.

Concurrent Action in the Senate

In the Senate, April 10, a motion to substitute the amendment for the adverse report of the Committee was defeated 6 to 31.

Other Suffrage Propositions

The Committee on Election Laws reported adversely, February 13, 11 to 0, on a bill to extend municipal suffrage to tax-paying women and on a bill to allow all women in towns to vote on questions involving the expenditure of money; and the reports were accepted in both houses without debate.

HOW IT WORKS IN COLORADO

I HAVE voted since 1893: I have been a delegate to the city and State conventions, and a member of the Republican State Committee from my county: I have been a deputy sheriff and a watcher at the polls: for twenty-three years I have been in the midst of the woman-suffrage movement in Colorado. For years I believed in woman suffrage and have worked day in and day out for it — I now see my mistake and would abolish it tomorrow if I could.

No law has been put on the statute book of Colorado for the benefit of women and children that has been put there by the women. The Child Labor Law went through independently of the women's vote. The hours of working-women have not been shortened; the wages of school-teachers have not been raised: the type of men that go into office has not improved a bit.

As for the effect of the vote on women personally, I have known scores of women who worked for the Republican party one year and worked for the Democratic party next year, telling me frankly that "the Democrats gave us more money."

Frankly, the experiment is a failure. It has done Colorado no good: it has done woman no good. The best thing for both would be if tomorrow the ballot for women could be abolished. — *Mrs. Francis W. Goddard, President of the Colonial Dames of Colorado, in The Ladies' Home Journal.*

Suffragists insist that adverse criticisms of the results of woman suffrage in Colorado and other suffrage States come from outsiders, who have only a superficial knowledge of the things of which they speak. But what reply, except personal abuse, can they make to such frank and positive testimony as this? Here is an intelligent, active and public-spirited woman, formerly an advocate of suffrage and a worker for it, and a sharer in all the responsibilities which the ballot brings; and she declares that woman suffrage is a failure, that it has done no good to woman or to the State, and that it would be best for both if the ballot for woman could be at once abolished. Of course, Mrs. Goddard foresaw that the publication of these views would immediately make her the target of suffragist vituperation, and her courage in facing such consequences adds strength to her testimony.

NOT "UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE"

THE suffragists are in the habit of describing Norway and Finland as "universal suffrage" countries, and of saying that in both all women of voting age are given the ballot. This is not true of either country. In reply to an inquiry, Mrs. Kiliani, International Secretary of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, recently received the following statement from the Norwegian Consul-General:

An act of July 1st, 1907, amending section 50 of the Norwegian constitution reads as follows: Entitled to vote are: Women who are Norwegian citizens, who have filled the 25th year, who have been residents of the country for five years and who reside there, and who have paid the state or communal tax for the last past tax year, etc., or who live in partly or wholly joint ownership of property with husband, who has paid such tax.

Mrs. Anna Holst, the wife of a professor at the University of Christiania, wrote last May: "At the present moment, more than 270,000 women have a vote; more than 230,000 are still excluded." A system under which only a little more than half the women are given the ballot cannot truthfully be described as "universal suffrage."

As to Finland, Mrs. Kiliani has obtained from the Russian Consul-General a copy of the law regulating the suffrage. From this it appears that persons are excluded from the suffrage "whose names do not appear in the tax-lists of the preceding three years" and those "who have not paid the assessed state taxes within the preceding two years from other causes than poverty attested by the communal authorities." This is not universal suffrage, but a form of tax-paying suffrage.

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

THE quickened interest in anti-suffrage manifests itself in increasing calls upon the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women from all parts of the country for arguments relating to the question. There never has been a time when so many women visited the headquarters of the Association, at Room 615, Kensington Building, to enrol themselves as members of the Association, or to ask for anti-suffrage literature. The conservative women of Massachusetts and of other States as well are beginning to realize that it is their duty to organize and to organize effectively against the misrepresentations of the suffragists. The time has passed when it was safe to keep silent. The enormous majority of women, in this and other states, who are opposed to woman suffrage, must make their opposition known.

ANTI-SUFFRAGE women, who want arguments in support of that cause, in convenient form, can obtain them by writing to the Association, or better, when possible, by calling at the Association headquarters. A subscription to THE REMONSTRANCE, at twenty-five cents a year, will bring to them once in three months the latest news and comment touching the question, at home and abroad. The secret of efficiency is personal work. If each member of the Association would exert herself to secure the enrolment of some other woman, the membership of the Association might be doubled in three months. There is no need of waiting for any machinery. The process is simple. Just get to work, and send in the names.

THE REMONSTRANCE records with great pleasure the formation of the

Maryland Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage. Miss Catharine Moone Selfe, the Recording Secretary, writes:

I am more than happy to announce the formation of the Maryland Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage with a strong membership. The Association has adopted by-laws, drafted along the lines of those of the New York and Massachusetts Associations. It is already printing and distributing the letter from Mrs. Goddard, condemning woman suffrage, and the comment made by the Hon. Moses Hallett on the same subject. The new Association held a public meeting March 13th, which was addressed by Justice Henry B. Brown of Washington, and Mr. Everett P. Wheeler of New York. We are assured of success. We feel that the sympathy of the thinking portion of the community is with us.

THE Maine correspondent of The Woman's Journal, in the issue of that paper for February 18th, complained that the Massachusetts anti-suffragists had sent copies of THE REMONSTRANCE to members of the Maine Legislature and added "We wish they would not 'butt in.'" This correspondent must be new to her work. If she had read The Woman's Journal carefully, she would understand that the thing to do is to insist that the greater the activity of the anti-suffragists the better for the suffrage cause, the invariable effect of anti-suffragist arguments being to make suffragists. Nothing could be more ill-timed than her naive complaint that Massachusetts anti-suffragists were "butting in" in Maine.

THE suffragists can find little to encourage them in the result of the canvass of the students at Wellesley College, which was made in January by the Equal Suffrage League. Of the 1,378 students registered, only 850 took the pains to record themselves; and of the 528 who did not vote, it is safe to assume that practically all are either opposed to suffrage or indifferent to it. Of the 850 who were recorded, only 293, — or less than one fourth of the whole student body, — voted in favor of suffrage. In every one of the four classes there was a strong majority against suffrage. This vote indicates that, in spite of their activity and their boastfulness the suffragists are making but a feeble impression upon college women.

NOT much more encouraging was the vote taken a few days later among the girls at the Franklin Square House, Boston. These young women are mostly self-supporting and are engaged in various employments. Some suffragist challenged the statement that not half of them were in favor of assuming the responsibility of the suffrage. Thereupon a ballot was taken; and only 96 voted in favor of suffrage and 180 against it, — a majority against suffrage of almost exactly two to one.

ONE assumption upon which the English "conciliation bill" rests is that women who now have the municipal vote suffer a great injustice in not having also the parliamentary vote. But the women themselves do not think so. A canvass has recently been made of women householders and women with occupier qualifications in 34 constituencies. The result shows that, out of a total electorate of 36,163 in these constituencies 16,520 women qualified to vote are opposed to parliamentary suffrage for women, and only 4,892 are in favor. Here is an adverse majority of more than three to one, among the very women who are represented as eager for the full suffrage, and this without taking into account the large number, 14,751, who are indifferent and failed to reply.

IN THE LEGISLATURES this year, the suffragists are concentrating most of their energies upon proposed constitutional amendments. They have succeeded in persuading the legislatures of Kansas, Nevada and California to adopt resolutions to submit to the people amendments to confer full suffrage upon women. The last time that such an amendment was voted on in Kansas was in 1894, when it was rejected by a majority of 34,827. Against these suffrage successes this year may be set the defeat of suffrage amendment resolutions in the legislatures of Michigan, Iowa, Maine and Montana; the defeat of municipal suffrage bills in Indiana and New Hampshire; the rejection by the Missouri legislature of a bill to make women eligible as school directors; the rejection by the Vermont House, by a vote of 97 to 126, of a bill giving women the right to vote at local option elections; and the defeat in the South Dakota House, by a vote of 26 to 69, of an amendment to grant full suffrage to women tax-payers.

SUFFRAGE IN ENGLAND

MAY 5th has been fixed as the date upon which the bill to confer the parliamentary franchise on women will come before Parliament. As before, it comes not as a government measure, but as a private bill. The so-called "conciliation committee" which aims to bring together men of different parties who are in favor of the measure, has cast the bill this year in the following form:

1. Every woman possessed of a household qualification, within the meaning of the representation of the people act (1884) shall be entitled to be registered as a voter, and when registered to vote for the county or borough in which the qualifying premises are situated.

2. For the purpose of this act, a woman shall not be disqualified by marriage for being registered as a voter, provided that a husband and wife shall not both be registered as voters in the same parliamentary borough or county division.

It will be noticed that, while the bill in its new form does not exclude married women as such, it gives the ballot to women who are living apart from their husbands, and withholds it from those who are living a normal married life.